



QUINCY PLANNING BOARD
Quincy City Hall, 1305 Hancock Street, Quincy, MA 02169
(617) 376-1362 FAX (617) 376-1097
TTY/TDD (617) 376-1375

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, November 19, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman William Geary, Richard Meade, Coleman Barry,
Glen Comiso

MEMBERS ABSENT: Sean Callaghan

OTHERS PRESENT: James J. Fatseas, Interim Planning Director
Margaret Hoffman, Principal Planner
Susan Karim, Assistant Planner
Rob Stevens, Principal Planner

Meeting held in 34 Coddington Street, 1st Floor, Room 121, Quincy, Massachusetts.

Meeting called to order and attendance roll call taken at 7:06 PM by Chairman William Geary.

VOTE TO ACCEPT September 9, 2015 2015 PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

MOTION: by Member Coleman Barry to approve the
September 9, 2015 Planning Board meeting minutes as written.

SECOND: Member Richard Meade

VOTE: 4-0 Motion Carries

VOTE TO ACCEPT October 21, 2015 2015 PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

MOTION: by Member Richard Meade to hold approval of the October 21, 2015 Planning Board
meeting minutes as written, due to members not present.

SECOND: Member Coleman Barry

VOTE: 4-0 Motion Carries

**7:08 PM Continued Public Hearing – 151 Granite Street – Site Plan/Special Permit Planning
Board Case #2015-37**

The Chairman received a letter from the Applicant's attorney requesting a continuance of the hearing
to the next Planning Board meeting, to allow petitioner to confer with Ward 3 City Councillor
Coughlin and members of the community at an upcoming neighborhood meeting.

Member Coleman Barry made a motion to continue the public hearing to January 13, 2016.

Member Richard Meade seconded the motion and it was so voted unanimously.

**7:09 PM Public Hearing – 150 Hancock Street – Site Plan/Special Permit - Planning Board
Case #2015-44**

The Chairman expressed issues of concern to the current proposal before the Board requesting no testimony be given and a continuance of the hearing to the January 13, 2016 Planning Board meeting, stating that attendees interested in the case could return on that date when the matter would be heard.

Member Coleman Barry made a motion to continue the public hearing to January 13, 2016. Member Glen Comiso seconded the motion and it was so voted unanimously.

7:10 PM Continued Public Hearing – 1073 Hancock Street– Site Plan/Special Permit – Planning Board Case No. 2015-32

The Chairman read the Public Hearing notice into record opening the case. He stated that the Board had not heard testimony on the project, nor had the petitioner given a presentation at the previous Planning Board meeting on October 21, 2015.

7:12PM The Chairman introduced the Applicant's Attorney, Robert J. Fleming, Jr., who responded by introducing the project team including the Applicant, Haocheng Trading USA, Inc., Civil Engineer James Burke of DeCelle-Burke & Associates, People Architects, the Traffic Engineer and Landscape Architect. Robert Fleming, Applicant's Attorney gave a brief overview of the project and the existing conditions of the site. Chairman Geary asked for elevations of the existing building, to which Attorney Fleming responded that he did not have them available in large format. The Chairman expressed his concern that for the audience to be able to have a full understanding of the project an appropriately scaled presentation would be necessary. He then circulated his own 11" x 17" plan set to audience members to give them an informed picture of the proposal. The Attorney continued his description of the project proposal. The issues that were discussed included converting the 17, 800 ± square foot building located in both a Business C and Historic District from its current use as 16 office suites into a 36 room hotel, a change of use that is allowed with the Business C Zoning District. He continued that the proposal would require special permits parking, setbacks, and loading bay. Attorney Fleming gave a brief overview of the Applicant, Haocheng Trading USA, Inc., which he said was based in China and was involved in a number of hotel and restaurant businesses there, a 60 room and 122 room hotel and 2 restaurants, as well as having recently opened a new restaurant in Porter Square in Cambridge, MA. The Attorney explained that the Applicant had purchased the property in 2012 with no intention to change the use, which continued to run as office space which competed with other area offices. He explained that in January 2013 Ward 1 City Councillor Margaret LaForest had a neighborhood meeting to discuss with her constituents the idea of a residential use for the building, similar to the micro units being proposed by developer StreetWorks as part of the downtown development. After 2 well-attended neighborhood meetings by the Councillor in January and February 2013, it was ultimately decided that the neighborhood did not like the project. The Applicant's response was to pursue the project based on his experience of running hotels, which he felt also satisfied the City's need for suitable downtown development. Attorney Fleming described the project as a full service hotel with improvements to the HVAC system, Fire Safety, ADA accessibility, stormwater and drainage components, and landscaping, emphasizing that its commercial use would enhance the neighborhood character, while providing employment opportunities. The Attorney also assured the audience that the Applicant had done a full traffic and parking study and that neither proved the development would be detrimental to the neighborhood.

7:22PM Planning Board Member Richard Meade inquired as to the number of rooms the Applicant's hotels in China had to which Attorney Fleming reiterated that the Applicant ran a 60 room and a 122 room hotel. Mr. Meade continued by inquiring how many years of experience the Applicant had in the hotel business, to which the Attorney responded 10 years. Attorney Fleming expounded upon his description of, what he referred to as a boutique hotel similar in setting to the Applicant's other

existing hotels. Mr. Meade asked for confirmation of the city size to which the Applicant responded that the city in China was indeed larger than Quincy. Chairman Geary clarified that the urban setting sounded closer in size to Boston than it was to Quincy, to which the Applicant agreed. Member Glen Comiso then inquired if this would be the Applicant's first US hotel, to which the Applicant responded yes. Mr. Comiso continued his questioning asking if there would be a full service restaurant onsite, to which the Applicant responded no, adding that the restaurant business was a lot harder than the hotel business. Mr. Comiso then expressed his concern for the noise level for hotel guests, being that the site was only a block and a half from the MBTA subway tracks. Attorney Fleming responded that he didn't think that excessive noise was an issue because there was an existing buffer and the addition of significantly improved windows would minimize audio impact, but that the issue would be taken into consideration. Mr. Meade inquired if the Applicant envisioned that the hotel would be long term stay, to which the Applicant said no, that he thought it would be short term stay of mostly parents visiting college students and business travelers. Chairman Geary asked the Applicant to estimate the length of stay for most hotel guests, to which the Applicant responded 1 week. Mr. Geary asked for confirmation of the hotel being described as 2 bedroom, which Mr. Fleming clarified that it would be 2 bed, not 2 bedroom, and would be a typical hotel room set up of either 2 queen sized beds or a single king.

7:30PM The Applicant's Engineer Jim Burke was introduced and gave a presentation on the existing conditions, including the building footprint, the landscape plan, catch basins and stormwater runoff. He described that the parking plan added pervious surfaces through the use of landscape elements which would assist in the stormwater management and improved drainage, reducing runoff and that the project would maintain the existing sewer service with the addition of new sewer elements. Chairman Geary asked about the drainage leeching into the soil or if there was no reported runoff or flooding with the existing conditions, to which Mr. Burke responded that test pits showed proper groundwater recharge and no flooding. Mr. Geary then asked about the building footprint shown on the design, specifically as regards the basement drive through being used for parking. Mr. Burke replied that there would be 3 ground level surface parking spaces. Member Comiso inquired about the parking setback along Adams Street, to which Mr. Burke described the access/egress hadn't changed from the existing configuration and that the vehicular traffic pattern would remain one-way, which would be made clear with proposed signage. Chairman Geary then asked about the existing arrangement of the abutting business of Flavin and Flavin using parking spaces within the site's lot, wanting to know if these spaces were rented. Attorney Fleming stated that they had a verbal gentlemen's agreement. The business's owner, Ed Flavin clarified that the arrangement consisted of his business paying the Applicant a certain amount per month for the convenience of using 1 or 2 parking spaces per day, with an occasional few more. Attorney Fleming also addressed that the revised plans had relocated the dumpster to a more appropriate location. Mr. Geary asked if the building's existing parking was underutilized and what was the current building occupancy, to which the Attorney replied that only 7 suites out of 16 were occupied, making the parking underutilized and the change of use more viable. Following an inquiry by Member Meade there was some discussion of mound studies and landscape features, all of which Engineer Burke explained. Attorney Fleming introduced Monica Tong and Paul Yu from Peoples Architects who described the interior renovations of the 160 square foot and 480 square foot room and other upgrades, explaining that the only exterior renovation would be energy efficient replacement windows and the inclusion of an ADA compliant entrance utilizing an electronic ramp. Member Comiso asked about the signage, to which Attorney Fleming responded that a banner sign would be used in compliance with the City's Zoning Ordinance. Planning Board Member Coleman Barry expressed his concern that the project wasn't addressing the building's outdated appearance with exterior renovations, stating that the current design was not aesthetically appealing and that he wanted the architects to provide color renderings to see what the proposed windows would look like and gain an understanding of how the

proposed design would modernize the existing structure. He added that the existing fire escape was an eye sore and inquired if that could be modified in the revision. He also asked what clientele the hotel would be marketed to, to which the Applicant responded that it would be marketed predominantly to foreign travelers, business travelers, and tourists visiting Boston. Chairman Geary then stressed the importance of providing full size renderings as beneficial to the audience's understanding of the project. He also addressed traffic concerns, asking if the Applicant thought that most visitors would arrive by taxi or rental car. Member Meade asked to be shown proposed signage, to which Attorney Fleming agreed the team would provide along with the requested window design. Chairman Geary then opened the case up to the audience for public testimony. Ward 1 City Councillor Margaret LaForest spoke, asking the audience for a show of hands of how many people were in attendance to hear about this project. Most audience members raised their hands, and the Councillor continued stating that she wanted to see the traffic analysis to share with her constituents, going on to describe many neighborhood concerns including the dumpster not being properly locked and the promised removal of graffiti remaining unaddressed. She described the property conditions as ugly and wanted clarification of the basement and room layouts in the architecture plans, as well as a detailed snow removal plan. The Councillor affirmed that the project needs exterior improvements and that the outstanding neighborhood concerns regarding parking, aesthetics, and safety issues needed to be addressed. Member Barry supported this with an inquiry about the safety of the parking lot, asking what lighting was part of the proposal to address this. The Applicant assured that proposed lighting with motion sensors would address this issue. Chairman Geary again asked if any audience members wished to speak. Abutters Ed Flavin, Betty Licione, Beverly McDonald, Heather Trudalis, Kathy Egan, Bill Meyer, John Thompson, Jim Nichols, John McCullen, and Nicole (last name not given) all spoke, each stating that the neighborhood received the project extremely poorly because they don't see it as beneficial, but indeed as a drain on the residential community.

8:38PM Chairman Geary mentioned a comment letter submitted by Kathryn Clancy and closed the public testimony period. Member Barry issued a final comment that the project begs assurance of quality for the clientele. Attorney Fleming responded by stating the Applicant's 2 million dollar initial investment in the property, opining that such an investment and the cost of renovation should result in committed upkeep of the property. The Chairman stated that the project is still under review and as such, the hearing should be left open. He suggested a continuance to the January 13, 2016 Planning Board meeting.

Member Richard Meade made a motion to continue the Public Hearing to January 13, 2016. Member Coleman Barry seconded the motion and it was so vote unanimously.

8:46 PM Public Hearing – 52 Grafton Street – Site Plan/Special Permit - Planning Board Case No. 2015-45

The Chairman read the Public Hearing notice into record, noting that there were still outstanding issues to that needed to be addressed in plan revisions, as well as time for review for the project to be able to move forward.

Member Richard Meade made a motion to continue the Public Hearing to January 27, 2016. Member Glen Comiso seconded the motion and it was so vote unanimously.

8:47 PM Continued Public Hearing – 143 & 147 Newbury Avenue– Site Plan/Special Permit - Planning Board Case No. 2015-35

The Chairman read the Public Hearing notice into record. He then introduced the project Attorney Robert J. Fleming, Jr. Attorney Fleming started by stating that revisions had been made to the plans addressing Peer Review comments and the draft recommendations that had been submitted for

review. The Attorney introduced the project team. Chairman Geary opened the meeting to the public to speak on the matter.

Member Coleman Barry made a motion to close the Public Hearing.

Member Glen Comiso seconded the motion and it was so vote unanimously.

8:48 PM Chairman Geary called on Project Planner Margaret Hoffman to read the conditions for approval of the Planning Board Decision. Ms. Hoffman read the following Special Conditions into the record:

- 1) The Applicant's Engineer has produced A Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) which was issued by FEMA on April 8, 20 15 (FEMA Case No. 15-01-0874P) in regards to the flood plain in the vicinity of the subject property. The LOMR attempts to remove the subject property and the surrounding area from the flood plain. At the time of the Application the revised Flood Plain Maps have not been issued a final approval by FEMA and have not been accepted by the City of Quincy. No construction or site work will occur prior to the City Council's official approval of said FEMA maps.
- 2) The City's Engineer has indicated that the area is subject to coastal flooding per the 2014 FEMA Maps. In the event that the 2015 FEMA Floodplain Maps are not adopted within a year of the Planning Board's decision, the Applicant shall be required to file with the Conservation Commission and shall adhere to any requirements of an Order of Conditions that may be issued by the City of Quincy Conservation Commission.
- 3) The project is subject to the Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance. The Applicant shall contact the Affordable Housing Trust Committee (AHTC) for their recommendation related to affordable units and adhere to any requirements of the AHTC.
- 4) The Applicant shall seek approval from the City of Quincy Zoning Board of Appeals or Zoning Enforcement Officer, as appropriate, for any required variances from the City of Quincy Zoning Ordinance which are not under the authority of the Planning Board.
- 5) The Applicant shall develop a Construction Management Plan for site work and any utility work within the public way, which shall be provided and approved by the City's Traffic Engineer at least one month prior to construction.
- 6) Information on the height limitations of the parking lifts, including restricting the use of car top cargo carriers shall be provided to residents through the use of signage and training in the operations of lifts.
- 7) The Applicant shall submit the manufacturer's information on the parking lifts for review and approval by the City's Director of Inspectional Services and the Planning Department prior to the issuance of building permits.
- 8) The Stormwater maintenance plan shall be recorded at the Norfolk County Registry of Deeds along with the Planning Board Decision.
- 9) The Applicant shall perform a proper soil evaluation in the location of the of the two proposed Cultec infiltration systems after demolition of the existing building and prior to construction. If necessary, a mounding analysis shall also be performed at this time and if these results require any revisions to the subsurface system the system must be approved by the DPW Engineer, Planning Department and Peer Reviewer prior to construction.

- 10) All Signs and pavement markings to be installed within the Project site shall conform to the applicable specifications of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).
- 11) Signs and landscape features to be installed along the Project site frontage on Newbury Avenue within the sight triangle areas of the Project site driveway should not exceed 2.5 feet in height as measured from the surface elevation of the Project site driveway.
- 12) Snow windrows along the Project site frontage on Newbury Avenue within the sight triangle areas of the Project site driveway shall be promptly removed when such accumulations exceed 2.5 feet in height.
- 13) A bicycle rack should be provided proximate to the building entrance.
- 14) The proposed building foundation will be properly waterproofed to accommodate the proximity of the proposed infiltration system (3') according to the approved plans.
- 15) Prior to construction, an application for a Drain Connection Permit will be filed with the Quincy Department of Public Works.
- 16) The existing bituminous concrete sidewalk along the Newbury Avenue property line is to be reconstructed instead of individual patch work for utility trenches.
- 17) The Applicant shall install stone or concrete survey monuments to delineate the public right-of-way. The monuments shall be set by a professional land surveyor and be installed prior to the acceptance of as-built plans.
- 18) Upon completion of the project, the applicant shall furnish along with the digital file as built plans showing all utilities, building footprints, reference bounds and benchmarks defining the total site, facilities and rights of way.
- 19) The Applicant must submit documentation to the Health Department that construction activities proposed for the development of this facility will not cause rodent problems for abutters. We require a rodent control plan be developed and submitted to this department for review and approval prior to any site activity.
- 20) The Applicant shall ensure that the dust and noise control plans be developed and incorporated within all construction specifications and permits issued for this project.
- 21) Newly amended regulations require a pre- demo survey for any potential asbestos-containing materials (ACM) be conducted by a DLI-certified inspector. If ACM is present, it must be removed by a licensed contractor, and a post-abatement inspection must be performed by DLI-certified project monitor. A pre-demolition inspection of this structure will be required to be performed by the Health Department.
- 22) The hours for construction activities and delivery of materials will be as follows:
 - 7:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday thru Friday
 - 8:00 am to 4:00 pm Saturday.
 - All construction and deliveries shall be prohibited on Sunday unless a permit is approved by the Chief of Police for Sunday activity dates.

Chairman Geary asked if there were any questions. None.

Member Coleman Barry made a motion to close the Public Hearing.

Member Richard Meade seconded the motion and it was so vote unanimously.

**8:59 PM Continued Public Hearing – 100-134 Parkway– Quincy Center Districts
Special Permit Site Plan Review - Planning Board Case No. 2015-46**

Chairman Geary opened the continued public hearing and read the Notice of Public Hearing into the record. He introduced the project Attorney Robert Harnais, who stated that previous review comments were addressed, including the inclusion of parking space striping at the building entrance, the striping and painting of van parking spots, noting that the applicants were highly experienced in the running of adult daycare facilities, the use for which the project is slated, and knew how best to negotiate the pick-up and drop off area without issue. He stated that the project satisfies the community need for such a facility. The Chairman then introduced Project Planner Robert Stevens who gave an overview of the project and his diligence in determining its appropriateness via a site visit of a similar existing project. Mr. Stevens stated that the Applicant had agreed to the requested site clean-up and described the Ross garage driveway as not being an official roadway. He further stated that the Applicant had agreed to provide 2 parallel parking spaces for the facility which would be restriped as per the City Traffic Engineer's review. Mr. Stevens continued, stating that there had been concern for pedestrian conditions, especially for the facility's elderly clientele, and that it had been determined that capturing 4 parking spaces at the front door for the van pick-up and drop off area was recommended and ok'd by the City Traffic Engineer. Mr. Stevens then read the following Special Condition for approval of the Decision: The Applicant shall paint/repaint parallel parking spaces along the entire driveway located to the east of the 100 Parkway structure. Final painting plan will be prepared by the Applicant and be submitted to the City's Traffic Engineer for approval prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit. Attorney Harnais complied with the condition. Chairman Geary then opened the continued public hearing to the public for comment. None.

Member Richard Meade made a motion to close the Public Hearing.

Member Coleman Barry seconded the motion and it was so vote unanimously.

Member Barry then asked a final question regarding what the signage would be. The Applicant responded, stating that the signage would be minimal – an approved banner type only at the entrance, and that there was not a need for additional or larger signage because the clientele was by referral.

Member Coleman Barry made a motion to close the Public Hearing.

Member Richard Meade seconded the motion and it was so vote unanimously.

**9:01 PM Continued Public Hearing – 600R Crown Colony Drive–Site Plan Review -
Planning Board Case No. 2014-01**

Chairman Geary opened the continued public hearing and read the Notice of Public Hearing into the record. He stated that there was a list of lengthy conditions, too numerous to read at length, and that printed copies of the conditions were available to be handed out to the public. Mr. Geary then introduced Project Planner Robert Stevens once again to give a brief overview of the recommendations. Mr. Stevens gave a brief narrative of the project process from the initial Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) analysis to the continued vetting of drainage issues. He additionally stated that the Landscape Architect and Peer Review Consultant had continued their vetting of the project elements. He said that the concern for traffic mitigation had been continuously addressed and that a good deal of suggested improvements had come from the MEPA process. Mr. Stevens said the City had been working with the Applicant's Traffic Engineer as well as the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT). He stated that the Applicant

was required to submit a cost estimate to be approved the City Traffic Engineer and the Planning Board. Mr. Stevens said that he was satisfied with both the MEPA & City Traffic Review. Chairman Geary acknowledged that there had previously been a full presentation of the project at its opening public hearing.

Member Richard Meade made a motion to close the Public Hearing.

Member Glen Comiso seconded the motion and it was so vote unanimously.

Member Coleman Barry made a motion to approve the Site Plan under Quincy Zoning Ordinance Title 17, Section 9.5.1 subject to the stipulated conditions. Member Richard Meade Seconded the motion and it was so voted unanimously.

The Board confirmed that their next Planning Board Meeting would be held on December 3, 2015.

Member Glen Comiso made a motion to adjourn at 10:02 p.m. Member Coleman Barry seconded the motion and it was so voted unanimously.